



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,547	12/04/2003	Ilan Atias	PDS-014	5474
39933	7590	12/06/2006	EXAMINER	
POWERDSINE LTD. C/O LANDONIP, INC 1700 DIAGONAL ROAD, SUITE 450 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2866			TRUJILLO, JAMES K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2116	

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/726,547	Applicant(s) ATIAS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James K. Trujillo	2116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-18, 21-38 and 40-43 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) 19, 20, 39 and 44 is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 031004,033105,090805.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. The office acknowledges the receipt of the following and placed of record in the file:
2. Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

5

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10 4. Claim 10-13, 16, 17 and 18, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 10 recites the limitation "powered devices" in line 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Specifically, there is no antecedent basis that there is a plurality of devices in the queue.

6. Regarding claims 11-13 and 16, they are dependent upon claim 10, therefore they also suffer from the same lack of antecedent basis.

7. Claim 17 recites the limitation "said identifiers" in line 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Specifically, there is no antecedent basis that there is a plurality of identifiers in the queue.

20 8. Claim 18 recites the limitation "said identifiers" in line 2-3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Specifically, there is no antecedent basis that there is a plurality of identifiers in the queue.

9. Claim 30 recites the limitation "each of said attached powered device" in line 4 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Specifically, there is no antecedent basis that there is a plurality of identifiers in the queue.

5

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

10 (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

15 11. Claim 1, 2, and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Le Creff et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0072438 (cited in IDS dated 10 March 2004).

12. Regarding claim 1, Le Creff teaches a method for notifying an end user of a powered device on an Ethernet based network that the powered device will not be powered due to an excess demand condition (recognizing the situation when no power can be supplied to a terminal, paragraph [0007]), the method comprising:

- a. detecting an attached powered device (detecting the presences of a telecommunications terminal, paragraph [0004]);
- b. identifying an excess demand condition (power cannot be supplied to a terminal, paragraph [0007]);

c. supplying power to said attached powered device for a first time interval thereby notifying an end user that the powered device is not being powered because of an excess demand condition (paragraphs [0011] – [0012]).

13. Regarding claim 2, Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above.

5 Le Creff further teaches wherein said powered device is a IEEE 802.3 compliant device (paragraph [0003]).

14. Regarding claim 4, Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff further teaches wherein said supplying power is accomplished by one of an Ethernet switch and a Midspan device (switch, concentrator or a repeater, paragraph [0018]).

10 15. Regarding claim 5, Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising identifying the class of said attached powered device, said class comprising the power requirements of said attached powered device (class of said terminal, paragraph [0011]).

16. Regarding claim 6, Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above.

15 Le Creff teaches further comprising signaling said attached powered device of said excess demand condition (unable to supply required power and activate an alarm, paragraph [0011]).

17. Regarding claim 7; Le Creff taught the method according to claim 6, as described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising displaying on said attached powered device a message indicative of said excess demand condition (paragraph [0028]).

20

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2116

5 (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 3, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Creff.

20. Regarding claim 3, Le Creff teaches the method according to claim 1, as described above.

10 Le Creff teaches that his system is used in an Ethernet environment according IEEE 802.3af, but does not explicitly disclose wherein detecting is accomplished over a connection selected from among 10BaseT, 100BaseT and 1000BaseT. The examiner takes official notice that 10BaseT, 100BaseT and 1000BaseT are well-known and commonly physical wiring that are used to connect devices in an Ethernet environment and is one of several media specified in IEEE 802.3

15 that are widely available and reliable. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art having the teachings of Le Creff and the knowledge of the commonly used 10BaseT, 100BaseT and 1000BaseT connections to modify Le Creff to use 10BaseT, 100BaseT or 1000BaseT connections. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because they are widely available and reliable types of physical wiring.

20 21. Regarding claims 14 and 15, Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff does not explicitly disclose wherein said first time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the time interval between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Applicant has not 25 discloses that first time interval being between 10 seconds and 2 minutes provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art,

furthermore would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any short time period because Le Creff teaches that the user only needs to be informed for a short time period. Similarly claim 15 is rejected for the same reason as claim 14. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify Le Creff to obtain the invention as recited in claims 14 and 15. Further, the multiple time intervals for the first time interval in claims 14 and 15 is construed to be an admission that the criticality does not reside in the type of actual time interval utilized and hence obvious variations of one another.

22. Claims 8-13, 16, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Creff in view of Lehr et al, U.S. Patent 6,473,608.

23. Regarding claim 8, Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff does not explicitly disclose wherein further comprising storing an identifier of said detected attached powered device in a queue.

Lehr teaches storing an identifier of a detected attached powered device in a queue (wherein a node is interpreted to be a device, col. 38, lines 52-60 and figure 19C; wherein in Lehr when a node is added to the queue an identifier is inherently required). Lehr is in the same field of endeavor as that of Le Creff in that both are directed toward supplying power to devices. Lehr further teaches to one of ordinary skill in the art that using a queue provides an advantage of easily keeping track of the power consumed by the devices.

20 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Le Creff and Lehr before them at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Le Creff to include the queue as taught by Lehr.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to provide an easy means to track the power consumed by the devices in view of Lehr.

24. Regarding claim 9, Le Creff taught the method according to claim 5, as described above.

Further, claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 8 in view of Lehr.

5 25. Regarding claim 10, Le Creff together with Lehr taught the method according to claim 8, as described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising alternately supplying power to each of said attached powered devices in said queue for a second time interval (when no power can be supplied to the device it will turn it off after the message has been displayed, paragraph [0012]).

10 26. Regarding claim 11, Le Creff together with Lehr taught the method according to claim 10, as described above. Le Creff further teaches signaling said attached power device of said excess power demand condition (message on display of terminal, paragraph [0028]).

15 27. Regarding claim 12, Le Creff together with Lehr taught the method according to claim 11, as described above. Le Creff further teaches further comprising displaying on said attached powered device a message indicative of said excess demand condition (message on display of terminal, paragraph [0028]).

28. Regarding claim 13, Le Creff together with Lehr taught the method according to claim 11, as described above. Le Creff further teaches wherein said second time interval is substantially the same as said first time interval (when no power can be supplied to the device it will turn it off after the message has been displayed is substantially within the same first time interval, paragraph [0012]).

29. Regarding claim 16, Le Creff together with Lehr taught the method according to claim 10, as described above. Le Creff together with Lehr does not explicitly disclose wherein said

second time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Le Creff does not explicitly disclose wherein said second time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the time interval between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Applicant has not 5 discloses that second time interval being between 10 seconds and 2 minutes provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any short time period because Le Creff teaches that the user only needs to be informed for a short time period. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify 10 Le Creff to obtain the invention as recited in claim 16.

30. Regarding claim 17, Le Creff together with Lehr taught the method according to claim 8, as described above. Lehr further teaches wherein said first time interval is a function of the number of said identifiers in said queue (whether the new node requires power and if there is sufficient power available is dependent on other devices, col. 38, line 52 through col. 39, line 2).

15 31. Regarding claim 18, Le Creff together with Lehr taught the method according to claim 9, as described above. Lehr further teaches wherein said first time interval is a function of sum of the power requirements represented by said class of said identifiers in said queue (class of said terminal, paragraph [0011]).

20 32. Claims 21-27, 34, 35, and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Creff in view of Watamoto et al., U.S patent 6,392,695.

33. Regarding claim 21, Le Creff taught an apparatus for notifying an end user of a powered device on an Ethernet based network of that the powered device will not be powered due to an excess demand condition, the apparatus comprising:

- a. a powered device detector, for detecting an attached powered device (detecting the presences of a telecommunications terminal, paragraph [0004]);
- b. an excess demand identifier associated with said powered device detector, for identifying an excess demand condition (power cannot be supplied to a terminal, paragraph [0007]);
- c. a power enabler associated with said excess demand identifier and said timer, for supplying power to said detected attached powered device for said first time interval thereby notifying an end user that the powered device will not be powered because of said identified excess demand condition (paragraphs [0026] – [0028]).

Le Creff discloses a first interval (an alarm is sent for a short time, paragraph [0026]), but

15 does not explicitly disclose a timer for timing a first time interval.

Watamoto teaches a timer for timing a first interval (a predetermined time to display a warning inherently requires a timer, col. 3, lines 7-13). Watamoto further teaches the advantage in that the predetermined time provides a time period to which the user may notice the warning message.

20 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Le Creff and Watamoto before them at the time the invention was made to modify the time interval of Le Creff to include timer as taught by Watamoto.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to give the user a time period to notice a warning in view of Watamoto.

34. Regarding claim 22, Le Creff together with Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 21, described above. Le Creff further teaches wherein said powered device is a IEEE 802.3
5 compliant device (paragraph [0003]).

35. Regarding claim 23, Le Creff together with Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff teaches that his system is used in an Ethernet environment according IEEE 802.3af, but does not explicitly disclose wherein detecting is accomplished over a connection selected from among 10BaseT, 100BaseT and 1000BaseT. The examiner takes
10 official notice that 10BaseT, 100BaseT and 1000BaseT are well-known and commonly physical wiring that are used to connect devices in an Ethernet environment and is one of several media specified in IEEE 802.3 that are widely available and reliable. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art having the teachings of Le Creff and the knowledge of the
commonly used 10BaseT, 100BaseT and 1000BaseT connections to modify Le Creff to use
15 0BaseT, 100BaseT or 1000BaseT connections. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because they are widely available and reliable types of physical wiring.

36. Regarding claim 24, Le Creff together with Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff further teaches wherein said supplying power is accomplished by one of an Ethernet switch and a Midspan device (switch, concentrator or a
20 repeater, paragraph [0018]).

37. Regarding claim 25, Le Creff together with Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising identifying the class of said

attached powered device, said class comprising the power requirements of said attached powered device (class of said terminal, paragraph [0011]).

38. Regarding claim 26, Le Creff together with Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff teaches Le Creff teaches further comprising signaling said 5 attached powered device of said excess demand condition (unable to supply required power and activate an alarm, paragraph [0011]).

39. Regarding claim 27, Le Creff together with Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 1, as described above.

40. Regarding claims 34 and 35, Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as 10 described above. Le Creff does not explicitly disclose wherein said first time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the time interval between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Applicant has not discloses that first time interval being between 10 seconds and 2 minutes provide's an advantage, 15 is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any short time period because Le Creff teaches that the user only needs to be informed for a short time period. Similarly, claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 34. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify Le Creff to obtain the invention as 20 recited in claims 34 and 35. Further, the multiple time intervals for the first time interval in claims 34 and 35 is construed to be an admission that the criticality does not reside in the type of actual time interval utilized and hence obvious variations of one another.

41. Regarding claim 40, Le Creff teaches a powered device adapted to sense an excess demand condition comprising:

- a. a controller (to control a display, paragraph [0028]);
- b. a display associated with said controller (to control the display, paragraph [0028]);
5 and
- c. displays a message indicating an excess demand condition on said display (paragraph [0028]).

Le Creff does not explicitly disclose a non-volatile memory associated with said controller, whereby said controller compares a current time marker with a time marker stored on
10 said non-volatile memory, and in the event the difference between said current time marker and said stored time marker are less than a specified time interval displays a message indicating an excess demand condition on said display.

Watamoto teaches a controller that compare a current time marker with a time marker stored on a memory, and in the event of the different between said current time marker and said
15 stored timer marker are less than a specified time interval displays a message (a predetermined time requires storage on a memory such as in the counter, col. 3, lines 7-13 and col. 4, lines 19-42). Watamoto further teaches the advantage in that the predetermined time provides a time period to which the user may notice the warning message.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Le
20 Creff and Watamoto before them at the time the invention was made to modify the time interval of Le Creff to include timer as taught by Watamoto.

The examiner takes official notice that non-volatile memories are well-known to those of ordinary skill in the art and provide the advantage of keeping data even when power is removed from it.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Le Creff and Watamoto and the knowledge of non-volatile memories to modify Le Creff combined with Watamoto to use to use a non-volatile memory to hold the predetermined time.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification to provide the advantage of keeping the predetermined time even when power is removed from the system.

10 42. Regarding claim 41, Le Creff together with Watamoto taught the powered device according to claim 40 as described above. Le Creff further teaches wherein said powered device is an IEEE 802.3 compliant device (paragraph [0003]).

43. Regarding claim 42, Le Creff together with Watamoto taught the powered device according to claim 40 as described above. Le Creff futher teaches wherein said powered device 15 comprises an Internet Protocol (IP) telephone, an IP camera, a laptop computer or other portable computing device, a desktop computer, a door controller, a cellular base station or a wireless access control (data terminal equipment DTE within 802.3 is interpreted to include at least a desktop computer).

44. Regarding claim 43, Le Creff teaches a method for detecting an excess demand condition 20 in a powered device, comprising: displaying an excess demand condition message in the event that said time difference is less than a specified time interval (paragraph 28).

Le Creff does not explicitly disclose teaches obtaining a current time marker; comparing said current time marker with a previously stored time marker, thereby obtaining a time difference.

Watamoto teaches obtaining a current time marker (using a counter with a predetermined time, col. 4, lines 19-42); comparing said current time marker with a previously stored time marker, thereby obtaining a time difference (the counter is compared to a predetermined time, col. 4, lines 19-42).

Watamoto further teaches the advantage in that the predetermined time provides a time period to which the user may notice the warning message.

10 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Le Creff and Watamoto before them at the time the invention was made to modify the time interval of Le Creff to include timer as taught by Watamoto.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to give the user a time period to notice a warning in view of Watamoto.

15
45. Claims 28-33, 36, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Creff together with Watamoto in further view of Lehr.

46. Regarding claim 28, Le Creff together with Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 21, as described above. Le Creff together with Watamoto does not explicitly disclose 20 further comprising a storer associated with said power enabler; and queue associated with said storer, said storer storing an identifier of said detected attached powered device in said queue.

Lehr teaches a storer associated with a power enabler and a queue associated with said storer, said storer storing an identifier of a detected attached powered device in said queue (wherein a node is interpreted to be a device, col. 38, lines 52-60 and figure 19C; wherein in Lehr when a node is added to the queue an identifier is inherently required and a queue inherently requires a storer such a memory device). Lehr further teaches to one of ordinary skill in the art that using a queue provides an advantage of easily keeping track of the power consumed by the devices.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Le Creff and Lehr before them at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Le Creff to include the queue as taught by Lehr.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to provide an easy means to track the power consumed by the devices in view of Lehr.

47. Regarding claim 29, Le Creff together with Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 25, as described above. Le Creff together with Watamoto does not explicitly disclose further comprising a storer associated with said power enabler; and queue associated with said storer, said storer storing an identifier of said detected attached powered device associated with said class of said attached powered device in said queue. However, claim 29 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 28 in further view of Lehr.

48. Regarding claim 30, Le Creff together with Watamoto and Lehr taught the apparatus according to claim 28, described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising an alternator associated with said power enabler said timer and said queue, wherein said timer times a second time interval, and said alternator alternatingly powers each of said attached powered device in

said queue for said second time interval (when no power can be supplied to the device it will turn it off after the message has been displayed, paragraph [0012]).

49. Regarding claim 31, Le Creff together with Watamoto and Lehr taught the apparatus according to claim 30, described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising signaling means associated with said power enabler for signaling said attached powered device of said identified excess demand condition (message on display of terminal, paragraph [0028]).

5 50. Regarding claim 32, Le Creff together with Watamoto and Lehr taught the apparatus according to claim 30, described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising a display associated with said powered device for displaying a message indicative of said excess demand condition 10 (message on display of terminal, paragraph [0028]).

51. Regarding claim 33, Le Creff together with Watamoto and Lehr taught the apparatus according to claim 30, described above. Le Creff teaches wherein said second time interval is substantially the same as said first time interval (when no power can be supplied to the device it will turn it off after the message has been displayed is substantially within the same first time 15 interval, paragraph [0012]).

52. Regarding claim 36, Le Creff together with Lehr taught the method according to claim 30, as described above. Le Creff together with Lehr does not explicitly disclose wherein said second time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Le Creff does not explicitly disclose wherein said second time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

20 At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the time interval between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Applicant has not discloses that second time interval being between 10 seconds and 2 minutes provides an

advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any short time period because Le Creff teaches that the user only needs to be informed for a short time period. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify 5 Le Creff to obtain the invention as recited in claim 36.

53. Regarding claim 37, Le Creff together with Watamoto and Lehr taught the method according to claim 28, as described above. Lehr further teaches wherein said first time interval is a function of the number of said identifiers in said queue (whether the new node requires power and if there is sufficient power available is dependent on other devices, col. 38, line 52 through 10 col. 39, line 2).

54. Regarding claim 38, Le Creff together with Watamoto and Lehr taught the method according to claim 299, as described above. Lehr further teaches wherein said first time interval is a function of the total power requirements represented by said class of said identifiers in said queue (class of said terminal and no power can be supplied to another device, paragraph [0011]).

15

Allowable Subject Matter

55. Claim 44 is allowed.

56. Claim 19, 20 and 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base 20 claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record does not teach or suggest individually or in combination displaying an

excess demand condition message in the event that said first time difference is less than a first specified time interval, and said second time difference is less than a second specified time interval. The prior art of record also does not teach or suggest individually or in combination a remover, for removing the identification of at least one attached powered device for which power

5 is now available from said queue.

Conclusion

57. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James K. Trujillo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3677.

10 The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on (571) 272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
15 Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would
20 like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



JAMES K. TRUJILLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TC 2100